



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

references are the rule. On p. 180 are tables giving number of instances of *quippe qui* and *ut qui* by decades, also of the omissions of *esse* or of the subject with the future infinitive; p. 183, n. 1, we learn that Livy uses the contracted forms of the perfect subjunctive rarely (12 times), greatly preferring the uncontracted (85 times); n. 2, before *l* Livy used *ac* 84 times, but *atque* only 4. I fail to see what interest such enumerations have for the college freshman. Yet he can skip them if not interested, and the teacher may perhaps get a little use out of them for the Latin writing work, assuming of course that the count is fairly accurate.

Much worse for the pupil is the system of cross-reference. Compare the following from p. 183: 51. *pereundi perdendique*: see §§ 59 and 63, *a*; *invexere*: see § 19, *a*; 52. *futurae*: "which will be:" see § 37, n.; *forsitan* . . . : see § 49. E.; *initio* . . . *ordiendae*: see § 62.

This is enough to exhaust the patience of even the most earnest pupil. There are over two thousand such cross-references in the notes alone. Very often, when you look up the reference, you find either a similar statement, or nothing in point, or a reference to still another passage.

The edition, in its present form, can not be recommended to the student beginning the study of Livy; yet there is a great deal of valuable information scattered through the book, which, if sifted and properly edited, would be valuable both for teacher and pupil.

HENRY A. SANDERS.

ANN ARBOR.

The Tragedies of Seneca. Rendered into English verse. By ELLA ISABEL HARRIS. London: Henry Frowde, 1904. Pp. xii + 466. \$2.40.

The tragedies of Seneca are of special interest to us, aside from their intrinsic value, for the triple reason that they are (with the exception of the *Octavia*) the sole representatives of Roman tragedy preserved entire, that they reflect the literary complexion of the artificial age in which they were produced, and that they had great influence in shaping the early English drama. They are, in fact, the stepping-stone between Greek and modern drama; for these tragedies, rather than the Greek plays, were the model for Italian, French, and early English tragedy. The principal reason for this was, no doubt, the fact that the Middle Age of Europe was an age of Latin rather than of Greek learning, and so Seneca was more accessible than the Greek dramatists. But it is also probable that his style and spirit appealed strongly to those later playwrights. The tragedies were especially popular in the early Elizabethan age, and a number of English translations of them appeared at that time. These different versions were collected in a single volume by Thomas Newton in 1585. The tragedies were again translated in 1761 by Glover.

Students of the development of the drama, and especially students of early English drama, have found these early translations hardly suitable for their purposes; and they will welcome this translation by Miss Harris as an invaluable help in their research.

Lack of space prevents any detailed comment upon the translation itself. Suffice it to say that the work has been done with great care, and that those who use the book may be assured that the translation is a trustworthy presentation of the original, so far as this can be said of any translation.

Both the dialogue and the lyric parts have been rendered into English blank verse. This represents very well the original *senarius*, but from the standpoint of literary form it is to be regretted that the choruses have not been translated into some corresponding lyric measures. If this had been done, a more faithful representation of Seneca would have been secured, and at the same time the monotony of the blank verse would have been broken. Such criticism of the book, however, is disarmed by the translator's own acknowledgement of this as the ideal form, and by her modest confession of hesitation in attempting the difficult task.

F. J. MILLER.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

Die Interpolationen in der Odyssee. By FRIEDRICH BLASS. Halle: Niemeyer, 1904. Pp. 306.

The writer of this book has made an enviable reputation in many different lines of work, though he is perhaps best known as the author of *Die attische Beredsamkeit*. The present work gains much of its interest from the fact that it contains the judgment of a famous scholar upon the results that have been reached by critics in a field he has hitherto left untouched, the Homeric poems. The point of view is exceedingly conservative. Blass believes as little in the many-headed Homer as in the Lernaean Hydra. He asserts that it is time to apply to the criticism of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* the same principles which we use in dealing with any other Greek or Latin writer. The *Odyssey* he believes to be in large part the work of one great poet; that is sufficiently proved by its unity. The inconsistencies in chronology are discussed, frankly granted, but set aside as proving nothing against the unity of authorship. The frequent repetitions, also, are accepted as characteristic of the Homeric style; no passage should be rejected on this ground, unless the context demands it.

About two-thirds of the volume is devoted to a discussion, book by book, of the interpolations due to rhapsodists, copyists, and others. In this section Blass rejects, as unsuited to the context or in conflict with Homeric ideas, 680 lines in all, made up for the most part of scattered passages of from one to five lines, longer passages being ix. 322-31; xv. 14-26, 74-85; and the description of the palace of Alcinous, vii. 103-31. As was to be expected, most of these